



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Marci Antonini Imperatoris in semet ipsum libri.* Recognovit  
HENRICUS SCHENKL. Editio maior. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner,  
1913. Pp. xl+267. M. 4.80.

*Idem.* Editio minor. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Pp. x+168. M. 2.

The editio maior contains an ample Praefatio, pp. iii-xxxii, a Conspectus Notarum, pp. xxxiii-xxxviii, Inscriptiones Testimonia, pp. xxxviii-xxxix, Corrigenda et Addenda, p. xl, Text, with testimonia and brief apparatus criticus, pp. 1-159, Scholia, pp. 160-61, Capitum Divisiones, pp. 161-64, Adnotationis Supplementum, pp. 165-95, Index Nominum et Locorum, pp. 195-98, Index Verborum, pp. 198-267. The editio minor omits the Praefatio, Adnotationis Supplementum, and Index Verborum.

This new edition of Marcus Aurelius in the Teubner series naturally challenges comparison with those of Stich and Leopold, and the comparison is distinctly in its favor. As against the former, the collation and evaluation of the manuscripts and the criticism of suggested emendations given by Schenkl is a great step in advance; in comparison with the latter, the Index Verborum constitutes a valuable addition. We have thus an edition which all readers of the philosopher on the throne should use. So thoroughly has the editor studied the MSS, editions and critical literature dealing with his author that we are safe in saying that it will be long before anything material shall be added to our resources, and consequently before another editor will be justified in undertaking a critical edition. What may be expected is at most a revision by the editor himself.

Of the editor's laborious and meticulous study of the MSS a reviewer can say nothing except in its praise. In so difficult an author, where the best tradition is extremely faulty, one may differ in details from the conclusions and preferences of the editor; but in most cases one will feel that the editor, after his comprehensive study, is as likely to be right as another. I have long read Marcus Aurelius and have made many tentative suggestions as to readings. This edition has shown that in most cases others had hit upon the same things, and I am pleased to see about half of their number adopted in the text duly credited to those who proposed them. As I have hitherto refrained from publishing emendations of Marcus Aurelius, I will here set down one which seems to have occurred to no one else, and yet seems to me all but certain: vi. 43 (p. 73, 9): *Μῆτι ὁ ἥλιος τὰ τοῦ ἑταυῦ ἀξιοῖ ποιεῖν; μῆτι ὁ Ἀσκληπιδὸς τὰ τῆς Καρποφόρου;* Here I should read *ὁ ἥλιος τὰ τοῦ Ὑετίου.*

The editor himself has been prolific of emendations and more or less hesitating suggestions introduced with *fortasse* or *malim*. A rough count of their number yields upward of a hundred instances. It is needless to say that many will never be adopted. One addition to the criticism of Marcus Aurelius which Schenkl has made available is the contribution of a scholar in whom American classical scholars are sure to take an interest. It was Capell Lofft, the younger, who made this contribution. Born in England

in 1806, entered at King's College, Cambridge, 1825, where he subsequently distinguished himself as a classical scholar and became a Fellow, he resided in America during the Civil War and "while living in the wilds of Minnesota, prepared an edition of the Self-Communion of Marcus Aurelius with critical notes to the Greek text. *Μαρκου Αυτουινου τα εις εαυτον*, sive ad seipsum commentarii morales. Recensuit, denuo ordinavit, expurgavit, restituit, notis illustravit . . . C. L. Porcher, N. Eboraci U.S. A.D. 1861. A. liberae reip. I" (so the *National Dictionary of Biography*). I have never seen the book, which the editor, as in several other instances, signed with a pseudonym. Whether he took the name Porcher in allusion to the *Stoa* or Porch, or because he had been called to the bar of the Middle Temple in 1834, I do not know. It is interesting to think of a scholar "in the wilds of Minnesota" engaged in textual criticism at a time when American scholars generally were content to work with things classical in a very different spirit. It is said that many of his suggestions were wild, as were his surroundings, but Schenkl's notes show a goodly number which are eminently deserving of consideration. In his old age Lofft purchased an estate called Millmead, in Virginia, where he died October 1, 1873.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

---

*Cicero und die epikureische Philosophie. Eine quellenkritische Studie.* Munich Dissertation by HANS URI. Leipzig, 1914. Pp. 116.

Hunting for sources will never cease, for probability and not certainty is the usual result of such speculation. Scholars are agreed that Cicero's knowledge of Epicureanism was derived from Greek sources, but beyond that there is no agreement and there cannot be. Uri would have Antiochus Cicero's principal authority in the refutation of Epicureanism, but he thinks that the exposition of the ethics of the school, given in the first book of the *De finibus*, was drawn from one compendium; and that Cicero was often independent in his treatment. Naturally, there can be no certainty in such theorizing; and, indeed, it is of no very great importance whom Cicero followed. His exposition is readable, even if not always accurate, and he has saved for us by the charm of his style and through his eloquent diction much that has perished of the work of the post-Aristotelian schools. His object was to present the broad outlines of the ethical systems that were popular in his day. He never took Epicureanism seriously; it was to him verily a simple philosophy, but it had not the simplicity of a gospel. We cannot suppose that, having this mental attitude, he was careful about the competency of his authorities. Uri has in his 116 pages covered the subject well. There is much polemic against earlier investigators, but most people will be satisfied with the supposition that book i of the *De finibus* was founded